

APPENDIX G:
SOCIOECONOMICS

APPENDIX G:

SOCIOECONOMICS

Appendix G contains two main sections. Section G.1 briefly describes the methods and data sources that were used to perform the socioeconomic analyses. Section G.2 presents tables containing fiscal data that were collected from each of the counties, cities, and school districts in the regions of influence (ROIs, as defined below) at each of the four sites: Anniston Army Depot (ANAD) in Alabama, Pine Bluff Arsenal (PBA) in Arkansas, Pueblo Chemical Depot (PCD) in Colorado, and Blue Grass Army Depot (BGAD) in Kentucky.

G.1 IMPACT ASSESSMENT METHODS

Socioeconomic analyses assessed the potential impacts from constructing and operating an ACWA facility on population, employment, income, housing, community services, and traffic in the ROI surrounding each site. This ROI includes counties in which the majority of site employees currently live (Table G.1). Impacts on agriculture from accidents at the site were assessed for an ROI that includes all counties partially or completely within a 30-mi (50-km) radius of the site. Impacts from accidents on loss of business activity were assessed for counties partially or completely within the protective action zone (PAZ) designated by the Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program (CSEPP) at each site (Table G.1).

G.1.1 Impacts on Regional Employment and Income

The impacts of ACWA facilities on regional employment and income were assessed by using regional economic multipliers, together with detailed data on life-cycle project expenditures for construction and operations. Multipliers capture the indirect (off-site) effects of on-site activities associated with construction and operation of each ACWA facility.

Multipliers were derived from IMPLAN input-output economic accounts for the ROI (MIG Inc. 2001).¹ The accounts show the flow of commodities from producers to industries and institutional consumers. They also show consumption activities by workers and owners of capital and imports from outside the region. The IMPLAN model includes up to 528 sectors representing industries in agriculture, mining, construction, manufacturing, wholesale and retail trade, utilities, finance, insurance and real estate, and consumer and business services. The model also includes information for each sector on employee compensation; proprietary and property income; personal consumption expenditures; federal, state, and local expenditures; inventory and capital information; and imports and exports.

¹ Mig Inc., 2001, IMPLAN data files, Stillwater, Minn.

TABLE G.1 Jurisdictions Included in the Regions of Influence at Each Potential ACWA Facility Location

Location	ANAD	PBA	PCD	BGAD
<i>Construction and Operations</i>				
Counties	Calhoun Etowah Talladega	Grant Jefferson Lincoln Pulaski	Pueblo	Clark Estill Fayette Jackson Madison
Cities	Anniston Attalla Gadsden Glencoe Hokes Bluff Jacksonville Lincoln Ohatchee Oxford Piedmont Rainbow City Southside Talladega Weaver	Alzheimer Gould Grady Jacksonville Little Rock Pine Bluff Poyen Sheriden Sherwood Star City Wabbaseka White Hall	Pueblo	Berea Irvine Lexington McKee Richmond Winchester
School districts	Anniston Attalla Calhoun County Etowah County Gadsden Jacksonville Oxford Piedmont Talladega City Talladega County	Alzheimer Gould Grady Little Rock North Little Rock Pine Bluff Poyen Pulaski County Sheriden Star City Watson Chapel White Hall	District 60 District 70	Clark County Estill County Fayette County Jackson County Madison County

TABLE G.1 (Cont.)

Location	ANAD	PBA	PCD	BGAD
<i>Accidents</i>				
Agricultural ROI counties	Blount	Arkansas	Crowley	Bath
	Calhoun	Cleveland	El Paso	Bourbon
	Cherokee	Dallas	Lincoln	Boyle
	Clay	Grant	Otero	Clark
	Cleburne	Hot Spring	Pueblo	Estill
	Etowah	Jefferson		Fayette
	Jefferson	Lincoln		Garrard
	Randolph	Lonoke		Jessamine
	Shelby	Pulaski		Jackson
	St. Clair	Saline		Laurel
	Talladega			Lee
				Lincoln
				Madison
				Meniffee
				Mercer
				Montgomery
				Owsley
				Powell
				Pulaski
				Rockcastle
				Wolfe
				Woodford
Loss-of-business PAZ counties	Calhoun	Arkansas	Pueblo	Madison
	Clay	Cleveland		
	Cleburne	Dallas		
	Etowah	Grant		
	St. Clair	Jefferson		
	Talladega	Lincoln		
		Lonoke		
		Pulaski		
		Saline		

Data on life-cycle expenditures associated with the construction and operation of each ACWA facility were derived from engineering-cost data provided by the construction and engineering contractors likely to build the facility. These data showed, for both construction and operation, details on individual cost components in terms of labor, materials, any subcontracts, and taxes. The data covered both direct expenditures (fabrication, installation, certification, testing) and indirect expenditures (contractor field expenses, contractor overhead and bond, construction management and project management expenditures, architectural and engineering expenditures). Data for these categories for the year in which these expenditures would occur were mapped into the relevant Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes to be used with multipliers from the IMPLAN model specified for the ROI counties.

Information on the expected pattern of expenditures within the ROI for the various items of equipment, materials labor, and subcontracts in each cost category was used to adjust total project expenditures. The extent of procurement within the ROI was estimated from data based on ROI employment in the relevant ROI sectors, together with ROI unemployment rates, or from data provided by the engineering and construction contractors.

IMPLAN multipliers for each sector in which regional spending occurs and data on expenditures were used to estimate impacts on ROI employment and income. Impacts on employment were described in terms of the total number of jobs created in the region in the peak year of construction and in the first year of operation. The relative impact of the increase in employment in the ROI was calculated by comparing total ACWA facility construction employment over the period in which construction occurs with baseline ROI employment forecasts over the same period. Impacts were expressed in terms of percentage point differences in the average annual employment growth rate with and without ACWA project construction. Forecasts were based on data provided by the U.S. Department of Commerce (DOC).

G.1.2 Impacts on Population

An important factor to consider in assessing the potential impacts from an ACWA facility is the number of workers, including their families and children, who would migrate into the ROI, either temporarily or permanently, as a result of the construction and operation of the facility. The capacity of regional labor markets to supply workers in the appropriate occupations required for facility construction and operation in sufficient numbers is closely related to the occupational profile of the ROI and occupational unemployment rates. To estimate the in-migration that would occur to satisfy direct labor requirements, the analysis developed estimates of available labor in each direct labor category that were based on ROI unemployment rates applied to each occupational category. Data on in-migration associated with indirect labor requirements were derived from estimates of available workers in the ROI economy that would be able to satisfy the demand for labor by industry sectors in which ACWA facility spending would initially occur. The national average household size was used to calculate the number of additional family members who would accompany direct and indirect in-migrating workers.

Impacts on population were described in terms of the total number of in-migrants arriving in the region in the peak year of construction and in the first year of operation. The relative impact of the increase in population in the ROI was calculated by comparing total ACWA facility construction in-migration over the period in which construction occurs with baseline ROI population forecasts over the same period. Impacts were expressed in terms of the percentage point difference in the average annual population growth rate with and without project construction. Forecasts were based on data provided by the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

G.1.3 Impacts on Local Housing Markets

The in-migration of direct and indirect workers during construction and operation could substantially affect the housing market in the ROI. The analysis considers these impacts by estimating the increase in demand for rental housing units in the peak year of construction and the increase in demand for owner-occupied units in the first year of operation. The impacts on housing were described in terms of the number of rental units required in the peak year of construction and the number of owner-occupied units required in the first year of operations. The relative impact on existing housing in the ROI was estimated by calculating the impact of ACWA-related housing demand on the forecasted number of vacant rental housing units in the peak year of construction and on the forecasted number of vacant owner-occupied units in the first year of operations. Forecasts were based on data provided by the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

G.1.4 Impacts on Community Services

In-migration associated with the construction and operation of an ACWA facility could translate into increased demand for educational services and public services (police, fire protection, health services, etc.) in the ROI. Estimates of the total number of in-migrating workers and their families were used to calculate the impact of ACWA facility construction and operation on the core ROI county (or counties) in which the majority of new workers would locate. Impacts of the facility on county, city, and school district revenues and expenditures were calculated by using baseline data provided in each jurisdiction's annual comprehensive financial reports forecasted for the peak year of construction and the first year of operations and were based on per capita revenues and expenditures for each jurisdiction. Population forecasts were based on data provided by the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Impacts of ACWA facility in-migration on community service employment were also calculated for the core ROI county (or counties) in which the majority of new workers would locate. The analysis used the estimates of the number of in-migrating workers and families to calculate the number of new sworn police officers, firefighters, and general government employees that would be required to maintain the existing levels of service for each community. Calculations were based on the existing number of employees per 1,000 persons for each community service. To analyze the impact on educational employment, the numbers of teachers in each school district that would be required to maintain existing teacher-student ratios across all student age groups were estimated. Impacts on health care employment were estimated by

calculating (1) the number of physicians in each county required to maintain the existing level of service (calculations were based on the existing number of physicians per 1,000 persons), and (2) the number of additional staffed hospital beds required to maintain the existing level of service (calculations were based on the existing number of staffed beds per 1,000 persons). Information on existing employment and levels of service was collected from the individual jurisdictions providing each service.

G.1.5 Impacts on Transportation

Impacts from an ACWA facility on transportation in the ROI were described in terms of the impacts that the increase in traffic would have on the major road segments used by existing employees to commute to and from the site. The analysis allocated the trips made by construction workers to individual road segments on the basis of the residential distribution of existing site workers. The impact on the existing annual average number of daily trips was then calculated, and the impact on the level of service provided by each individual segment was estimated. Traffic information was collected from state and county transportation departments.

G.1.6 Impacts of Accidents

Impacts from an accidental release of chemical agent were estimated in terms of losses in agricultural output and losses in business activity resulting from temporary evacuation. Because it is not possible to determine the geographical extent of any accidental release or the magnitude of damage to crops and livestock, a number of assumptions were made. The analysis assumed that all agricultural activity up to 30 mi (50 km) away from the facility could be affected by an accidental release. All counties lying either partially or completely within this region were included in the impact analysis. The analysis also assumed that any output affected would be quarantined, either by federal or state authorities or through voluntary action by producers, to avoid possible stigma effects. Because it is not possible to predict the likely wind speed and direction and the amount of chemical agent that would be released, it is also not possible to determine the volume of agricultural output that could be lost. The precise nature and location of specific crops and livestock are also unknown, since any given field could conceivably be used for a range of crops and animals over the duration of facility operations.

Because of these uncertainties, the analysis calculated the impacts for a number of loss scenarios in the 30-mi (50-km) agricultural ROI: 100% loss of output, 75% loss, and 50% loss. Impacts on the economy of the counties in the ROI were estimated by using data on crop and livestock output, payroll, and employment for each county in the ROI provided by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and DOC, and by using the relevant regional economic multipliers from the IMPLAN model. Impacts on output, income, and employment were estimated for each loss scenario.

Loss of business activity was assumed to occur over a short period associated with the evacuation of employees from businesses located in the county (or counties) in the PAZ. Because the duration of any evacuation cannot be determined, the impacts from the loss of activity for a single day were estimated. Because the extent of lost output in the PAZ cannot be determined, three loss scenarios were assumed: 100% loss of activity, 75% loss, and 50% loss. Impacts over multiple days could be calculated according to the length and extent of the evacuation. Impacts were estimated for output, income, and employment for each loss scenario by using IMPLAN economic accounts for the county (or counties) included in the PAZ.

G.2 ROI FISCAL DATA

TABLE G.2 Local Government Financial Characteristics in ANAD Region of Influence (millions of \$)

Category	Calhoun County			
	Calhoun County	City of Anniston	City of Jacksonville	Town of Ohatchee
Revenues				
Taxes	4.2	19.9	3.8	0.2
Licenses and permits	0.3	2.9	0.7	0
Intergovernmental	1.1	0.2	0.5	0
Charges for services	1.5	1.4	0.7	0
Fines and forfeits	0	0	0.3	0.1
Miscellaneous	0.8	1.3	0.7	0.1
Total ^a	7.9	25.7	6.7	0.5
Expenditures				
General government	3.8	2.6	1.3	0.2
Public safety	3.0	7.6	1.9	0.2
Highways and streets	0	4.6	0.8	0
Health, welfare, and sanitation	0.2	2.3	2.4	0
Culture and recreation	0.1	2.5	1.2	0
Debt service	0	0	0.7	0
Intergovernmental	0	0	0	0
Other	0.1	2.2	0.1	0
Total ^a	7.3	21.8	6.7	0.4
Revenues minus expenditures	0.6	3.9	0	0.1

TABLE G.2 (Cont.)

Category	Calhoun County			Etowah County		
	City of Oxford	City of Piedmont	City of Weaver	City of Attalla	City of Gadsden	City of Glencoe
Revenues						
Taxes	14.5	1.3	0.3	3.7	30.0	1.0
Licenses and permits	1.6	0.3	0.2	0.5	4.3	0.3
Intergovernmental	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.5	0.2	0
Charges for services	1.8	0.3	0.2	0	0.9	0.2
Fines and forfeits	0.2	0.1	0	0.4	0.6	0.2
Miscellaneous	1.4	0.6	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.1
Total ^a	19.8	3.0	0.9	5.2	36.3	1.8
Expenditures						
General government	1.5	0.4	0.2	0.6	4.6	0.3
Public safety	1.7	1.0	0.5	2.3	14.6	0.4
Highways and streets	3.0	0.7	0.1	1.2	3.7	0.2
Health, welfare, and sanitation	1.9	0.1	0.2	0.2	1.7	0.1
Culture and recreation	0.9	0.4	0	0.4	4.3	0.1
Debt service	0	0	0	0	0.1	0
Intergovernmental	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	1.4	0.1	0.1	0.3	5.4	0
Total ^a	10.6	3.3	1.0	5.3	34.3	1.5
Revenues minus expenditures	9.1	-0.3	-0.1	-0.2	2.0	0.4

TABLE G.2 (Cont.)

Category	Etowah County			Talladega County		
	Rainbow City	City of Hokes Bluff	City of Southside	Talladega County	City of Talladega	City of Lincoln
Revenues						
Taxes	4.8	0.7	0.8	2.1	5.8	869,203
Licenses and permits	0.6	0.2	0.3	0.1	1.3	186,187
Intergovernmental	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.8	0.2	23,220
Charges for services	0.3	0.2	0.3	1.4	1.3	1,99'
Fines and forfeits	0.1	0.1	0.1	0	0.6	
Miscellaneous	0.1	0	0	0.2	0.1	140,224
Total ^a	6.1	1.4	1.5	4.5	9.4	
Expenditures						
General government	1.2	0.3	0.4	2.1	0.8	0.5
Public safety	2.2	0.4	0.7	2.3	4.1	0.7
Highways and streets	0.4	0	0	0	2.4	0
Health, welfare, and sanitation	0.3	0.2	0.3	0	0.2	0
Culture and recreation	0.5	0	0.1	0	1.6	0
Debt service		0.1	0.3	0	0	0
Intergovernmental	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0.6	0.3	0	0.2	0.2	0
Total ^a	5.2	1.2	1.8	4.7	9.2	1.2
Revenues minus expenditures	0.9	0.2	-0.3	0.2	0.1	0

^a The sum of individual row entries and column totals may not correspond due to independent rounding.

Sources: Calhoun County Commission, *Report on the Calhoun County Commission*, Sept. 30, 1998. City of Anniston, *Comprehensive Annual Financial Report*, Sept. 30, 1999. City of Jacksonville, *Audit Report*, Sept. 30, 1998. Town of Ohatchee, *Financial Statement and Auditors Report*, Sept. 30, 1998. City of Piedmont, *Financial Statements and Auditors Report*, Sept. 30, 1999. City of Weaver, *Financial Statements*, Sept. 30, 1999. City of Attalla, *Audited Financial Statements*, Sept. 30, 1999. City of Gadsden, *Annual Financial Report*, Sept. 30, 1999. City of Glencoe, *Financial Statements and Supplementary Information with Independent Auditors Report*, Sept. 30, 1999. City of Rainbow City, *Audited Financial Statements*, Sept. 30, 1999. City of Hokes Bluff, Alabama, *Financial Statements and Supplementary Information with Independent Auditors Report, for the Year Ended September 30, 1999*. City of Southside, Alabama, *Financial Statements and Supplementary Information, Year Ended September 30, 1999*. Talladega County Commission, *Combined Statements of Revenues and Expenditures for the Year Ended September 30, 1999*. City of Oxford, Alabama, *Financial Statements and Auditors Reports*, Sept. 30, 1999. Talladega County Commission, *Combined Statement of Revenues and Expenditures*, Sept. 30, 1999. City of Talladega, *Financial Report*, Sept. 30, 1998. City of Lincoln, *Independent Auditors Report*, Sept. 30, 1998.

TABLE G.3 School District Financial Characteristics in ANAD Region of Influence
(millions of \$)

Category	Calhoun County				
	Calhoun County	City of Anniston	City of Jacksonville	City of Piedmont	City of Oxford
Revenues					
Local sources	5.5	3.4	1.1	0.5	1.9
State sources	37.2	12.2	6.3	4.4	10.6
Federal sources	0	0	0.2	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0.1	0.1
Total ^a	42.7	15.6	7.6	5.1	12.6
Expenditures					
Administration and instruction	34.2	9.8	6.4	4.5	10.7
Services	6.8	4.6	1.0	0.4	1.6
Debt service	0	0	0	0	0
Other	2.6	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.9
Total ^a	43.7	14.6	7.4	5.1	13.2
Revenues minus expenditures	-1.0	1.0	0.2	0	-0.6

Category	Etowah County			Talladega County	
	Etowah County	City of Gadsden	City of Attalla	Talladega County	City of Talladega
Revenues					
Local sources	4.9	5.3	1.3	7.4	3.0
State sources	31.1	19.8	7.6	29.9	12.6
Federal sources	0	0	0	0	0.1
Other	0	0	0	0	0
Total ^a	36.0	25.2	9.0	37.3	15.7
Expenditures					
Administration and instruction	30.7	21.9	7.3	27.1	12.5
Services	4.3	2.9	1.0	5.0	3.3
Debt service	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0.4	0.2	0.1	1.9	0
Total ^a	35.4	25.0	8.4	34.0	15.8
Revenues minus expenditures	0.7	0.3	0.6	3.3	0.1

TABLE G.3 (Cont.)

^a The sum of individual row entries and column totals may not correspond due to independent rounding.

Sources: Calhoun County Board of Education, *Independent Auditors Report*, Sept. 1999. City of Anniston, *General Purpose Financial Statements and Independent Auditors Report*, Sept. 30, 1999. City of Jacksonville, *General Purpose Financial Statements and Independent Auditors Report*, Sept. 30, 1999. Piedmont City Board of Education, *Financial Statement and Auditors Report*, Sept. 30, 1999. Oxford City of Board of Education, *Financial Statement and Auditors Report*, Sept. 30, 1999. Etowah County Board of Education, *Independent Auditors Report*, Sept. 1999. Gadsden City Board of Education, *General Purpose Financial Statements and Supplementary Information*, Sept. 30, 1999. City of Attalla, *General Purpose Financial Statements and Supplementary Information*, Sept. 30, 1999. Talladega County Board of Education, *Independent Auditors Report*, Sept. 1999. Talladega City, *Single Audit Reports*, Sept. 1999.

TABLE G.4 Local Government Financial Characteristics in BGAD Region of Influence
(millions of \$)

Category	Clark County		Estill County		Fayette County
	City of Winchester	Clark County	City of Irvine Estill	Estill County	Lexington/ Fayette County
Revenues					
Taxes	5.5	2.7	0.5	0.8	140.1
Licenses and permits	0.8	0 ^b	0	0	31.0
Intergovernmental	0.8	0.4	0	0.1	1.4
Charges for services	0	0	0.2	0	15.1
Fines and forfeits	0	0	0	0	0.3
Miscellaneous	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.4	3.9
Total ^a	7.8	3.5	0.9	1.2	191.8
Expenditures					
General government	1.5	1.3	0.4	0.6	21.3
Public safety	3.8	1.0	0.3	0.3	71.3
Highways and streets	0.8	0	0.1	0	24.9
Health, welfare, and sanitation	0.8	0.9	0	0.1	6.2
Culture and recreation	0	0.2	0	0	20.0
Debt service	0	0	0	0	11.4
Intergovernmental	0.5	0	0	0	4.6
Other	0	0	0	0.1	1.3
Total ^a	7.5	3.4	0.7	1.0	161.0
Revenues minus expenditures	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.2	30.8

TABLE G.4 (Cont.)

Category	Jackson County		Madison County		
	City of McKee	Jackson County	City of Berea	City of Richmond	Madison County
Revenues					
Taxes	0	NA ^b	0.2	1.3	2.3
Licenses and permits	0	NA	4.8	9.5	0
Intergovernmental	0	NA	0.2	1.0	0.3
Charges for services	0	NA	0.3	1.2	0
Fines and forfeits	0	NA	0	0.1	0
Miscellaneous	0.1	NA	0.3	0.5	0.5
Total ^a	0.2	NA	5.7	13.6	3.1
Expenditures					
General government	ND ^b	0.3	0.7	5.2	1.8
Public safety	ND	0	1.8	4.9	0.9
Highways and streets	ND	0	0.3	0.7	0
Health, welfare, and sanitation	ND	0	0.5	0.9	0.2
Culture and recreation	ND	0	0.5	1.8	0
Debt service	ND	0	0	0	0.1
Intergovernmental	ND	0	0	0	0
Other	ND	0.3	0.7	0	0.3
Total ^a	0.1	0.6	4.5	13.5	3.2
Revenues minus expenditures	0.1	NA	1.3	0.2	-0.2

^a The sum of individual row entries and column totals may not correspond due to independent rounding.

^b ND = No details were provided; data were available but not broken down. NA = not available. Zero = actual value after rounding.

Sources: City of Winchester, Kentucky, *Audited General Purpose Financial Statements for the Year Ended June 30, 1999*. Report of the Auditor of Public Accounts, *Audit Examination of the Clark County Fiscal Court, Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1998*. City of Irvine, Estill County, Lexington-Fayette Urban County Government, *Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for the Year Ended June 30, 1999*. City of Berea, Kentucky, *Audited Financial Statements and Supplemental Financial Information for the Year Ended June 30, 1999*. City of Richmond, Kentucky, *General Purpose Financial Statements, June 30, 1999*. Report of the Auditor of Public Accounts, *Audit Examination of the Madison County Fiscal Court, Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1998*.

TABLE G.5 School District Financial Characteristics in BGAD Region of Influence (millions of \$)

Category	Clark County Schools	Estill County Schools	Fayette County Schools	Jackson County Schools	Madison County Schools ^b
Revenues					
Local sources	6.7	1.7	104.5	1.1	11.3
State sources	13.0	9.4	62.0	9.2	25.6
Federal sources	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0.5	0	0	0.2	0
Total ^a	20.2	11.1	166.4	10.5	36.9
Expenditures					
Administration and instruction	15.0	8.1	106.5	6.7	27.9
Services	5.5	3.0	64.7	3.4	10.3
Debt service	0	0	0	0	0
Other					
Total ^a	20.5	11.1	171.2	10.1	38.3
Revenues minus expenditures	-0.3	-0.1	-4.8	0.4	-1.3

^a The sum of individual row entries and column totals may not correspond due to independent rounding.

^b Includes Berea Independent School District.

Sources: Clark County School District, *Financial Statements, Supplemental Information and Independent Auditors Reports, Year Ended June 30, 1999*. Estill County Board of Education, *Financial Reports and Independent Auditors Report, June 30, 1999*. Fayette County School District, *Financial Statements, Supplementary Information, and Independent Auditors Reports, Year Ended June 30, 1999*. Jackson County School District, *Audited Financial Statements and Supplemental Schedules for the Year Ended June 30, 1999*. Berea Board of Education, *Financial Statements, June 30, 1999*. Madison County School District, *Annual Report, June 30, 1999*.

TABLE G.6 Local Government Financial Characteristics in PBA Region of Influence
(millions of \$)

Category	Grant County				Jefferson County			
	Grant County	City of Sheridan	Town of Poyen	Jefferson County	City of Altheimer	City of Pine Bluff	Town of Wabbaseka	City of White Hall
Revenues								
Taxes	0.6	0.1	0	5.4	0.2	16.2	0.1	0.8
Licenses and permits	0	0	0	0		0.6	0	0.1
Intergovernmental	0.4	0.1	0	0.6	0	1.8	0	0.1
Charges for services	0.5	0.2	0	2.3	0	2.4	0	0
Fines and forfeits	0.2	0.1	0	0.6	0	1.5	0	0
Miscellaneous	0.1	0	0	0.3	0.1	0.4	0	
Total ^a	1.7	0.5	0	9.5	0.3	23.6	0.1	1.1
Expenditures								
General government	0.7	0.1	0	3.4	0.1	3.1	0.1	0.2
Public safety	0.6	0.3	0	4.7	0.1	14.3	0	0.4
Highways and streets	0	0	0	0	0	0.1	0	0
Health, welfare, and sanitation	0	0.2	0	0.1	0.1	2.1	0	0
Culture and recreation	0.1	0.4	0	0	0	0	0	0
Debt service	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Intergovernmental	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0.1	0	0	0	1.6	0	0
Total ^a	1.5	1.1	0	8.6	0.3	21.3	0.1	0.8
Revenues minus expenditures	0.1	-0.5	0	0.8	-0.1	2.3	0	0.3
Category	Lincoln County				Pulaski County			
	Lincoln County	City of Star City	City of Gould	City of Grady	Pulaski County	City of Jacksonville	City of Little Rock	City of Sherwood
Revenues								
Taxes	0.5	0.4	0.1	0	25.6	0	59.4	6.8
Licenses and permits	0	0	0	0	0	0.1	5.8	0.4
Intergovernmental	0.3	0.1	0	0	11.0	0.7	2.0	0.5
Charges for services	0.5	0	0	0	8.8	1.7	22.1	0
Fines and forfeits	0.1	0	0	0.1	1.0	0.5	2.8	2.5
Miscellaneous	0.2	0	0	0	1.9	0.1	2.2	0.7
Total ^a	1.6	0.5	0.2	0.2	48.4	3.2	94.3	10.9
Expenditures								
General government	0.6	0.1	0.1	0.1	17.5	2.1	17.4	2.7
Public safety	0.6	0.2	0.1	0.1	29.0	5.7	53.8	3.8
Highways and streets	0	0	0	0	0	0.3	0.8	1.2
Health, welfare, and sanitation	0.1	0	0	0	0.3	0	3.8	1.0
Culture and recreation		0	0	0	0	1.3	6.0	0.9
Debt service	0	0	0	0	0.8	0	0	0
Intergovernmental	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0.2	0	0	0	1.4	0	0	1.6
Total ^a	1.4	0.5	0.2	0.2	49.1	9.4	81.7	11.2
Revenues minus expenditures	0.2	0	0	0	-0.7	-6.3	12.5	-0.3

TABLE G.6 (Cont.)

^a The sum of individual row entries and column totals may not correspond due to independent rounding.

Sources: Grant County, *General Purpose Financial Statements*, Dec. 31, 1998. City of Sheridan, *Audit Report*, Dec. 31, 1998. Town of Poyen, *Compilation Report*, Dec. 31, 1997. Jefferson County, *General Purpose Financial Statements*, Dec. 31, 1998. City of Altheimer, *Compiled Financial Statements*, Dec. 31, 1998. City of Pine Bluff, *Comprehensive Annual Financial Report*, Dec. 31, 1999. City of White Hall, *General Purpose Financial Statements*, Dec. 31, 1998. Lincoln County, *General Purpose Financial Statements*, Dec. 31, 1998. City of Star City, *Audit Report*, Dec. 31, 1998. City of Gould, *Audit Report*, Dec. 31, 1997. City of Grady, *Compiled Financial Statements*, Dec. 31, 1998. Pulaski County, *General Purpose Financial Statements*, Dec. 31, 1998. City of Jacksonville, *Comprehensive Annual Financial Report*, Dec. 31, 1999. City of Little Rock, *Comprehensive Annual Financial Report*, Dec. 31, 1998. City of Sherwood, *Financial Statements and Supplemental Information*, Dec. 31, 1998.

TABLE G.7 School District Financial Characteristics in PBA Region of Influence
(millions of \$)

Category	Grant County		Jefferson County			
	Poyen	Sheridan	Alzheimer	Pine Bluff	Watson Chapel	White Hall
Revenues						
Local sources	0.3	0	1.1	9.6	1.4	6.3
State sources	1.9	0	2.0	22.9	12.0	7.7
Federal sources	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0.1	0	0.1	0.9	0	0.3
Total ^a	2.3	0	3.1	33.5	13.5	14.4
Expenditures						
Administration and instruction	1.3	a	1.6	18.4	8.6	8.3
Services	1.0	a	1.1	12.8	5.2	4.5
Debt service	0.1	a	0	0.3	0	0
Other	0	a	0	0.6	0.1	0
Total ^a	2.5	0	2.6	32.2	13.9	12.9
Revenues minus expenditures	-0.1	0	0.5	1.3	-0.4	1.6
Category	Lincoln County			Pulaski County		
	Star City	Gould	Grady	Pulaski County	Little Rock	North Little Rock
Revenues						
Local sources	1.5	0.3	0.4	35.9	64.7	14.4
State sources	5.4	1.1	1.4	73.7	78.1	32.8
Federal sources	0	0	0	0.6	0.1	0.1
Other	0.1	0	0	0	0	0
Total ^a	6.9	1.5	1.9	110.1	143.0	47.2
Expenditures						
Administration and instruction	4.0	0.7	0.9	81.4	94.4	31.8
Services	2.0	0.6	0.9	22.8	40.5	16.1
Debt service	0	0	0.1	0	0.1	0
Other	0	0	0	2.1	0	0
Total ^a	6.1	1.3	1.9	106.3	137.5	47.9
Revenues minus expenditures	0.8	0.1	-0.1	3.8	5.5	-0.6

TABLE G.7 (Cont.)

^a The sum of individual row entries and column totals may not correspond due to independent rounding.

^b No details were provided.

Sources: Town of Poyen, *Audit Report*, June 30, 1998. City of Sheridan, *General Purpose Financial Statements*, June 30, 1998. Altheimer, *General Purpose Financial Statements*, June 30, 1998. Dollarway, Pine Bluff, and Watson Chapel, *Accountants Report and Financial Statement*, June 30, 1998. White Hall, *Audit Report*, June 30, 1998. Star City, *Audit Report*, June 30, 1998. Gould, *Audit Report*, June 30, 1998. Grady, *Annual Financial Report*, June 30, 1998. Pulaski County, *General Purpose Financial Statements and Supplementary Information*, June 30, 1999. Little Rock, *General Purpose Financial Statements*, June 30, 1999. North Little Rock, *Financial Statements and Supplementary Information*, June 30, 1999.